DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 638 RE 001 372

STRENGTHENING READING SERVICES THROUGH INCREASING PROVISIONS FOR ELEMENTARY READING CENTERS.

Milwaukee Public Schools, Wis. Div. of Curriculum and Instruction.

Pub Date 67

Note-29p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.24

Descriptors-ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, *CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED, *READING CENTERS, READING CONSULTANTS, READING DIAGNOSIS, READING MATERIALS, READING SKILLS, *REMEDIAL READING, *RETARDED READERS, STUDENT ATTITUDES

Identifiers-Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, Milwaukee Public Schools

The purpose of this project was to strengthen and extend reading services by increasing elementary school reading centers in the culturally disadvantaged areas of Milwaukee. A basic tenet of the program was the belief that continuous growth in reading ability is necessary for good academic progress. Besides furnishing plentiful reading materials, the centers offered remedial services to slow readers and attempted to develop in them confidence in their ability to read and enjoy books. Fifteen schools, located in highly populated, culturally disadvantaged areas and 1,005 slow reading pupils participated. Two distinct research designs were used in the evaluation. The first consisted of a test-retest approach to note changes in reading skills and pupil attitudes. The second, based on a random sampling of children from all the city's reading centers, measured long term gains. The results indicated reading achievement gains among the experimental subjects which exceeded those of the test norm group. Student attitudes toward school changed very little. A positive change was found in the specific area of reading, and the data suggest that the centers were of real value to retarded readers. (WL)

ED022638

MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Division of Curriculum and Instruction

STRENGTHENING READING SERVICES THROUGH INCREASING PROVISIONS FOR ELEMENTARY READING CENTERS

SEPTEMBER 6, 1966-- JUNE 16, 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ECEIVED FROM THE
IEW OR OPINIONS
E OF EDUCATION

PROGRAM EVALUATION

conducted by

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES AND EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

in conjunction with

DEPARTMENT OF SPECIAL EDUCATION

RE 001 372

FUNDED UNDER TITLE 1 OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROJECT

Richard Gousha, Superintendent of Schools
Dwight Teel, Assistant Superintendent, Division of Curriculum and Instruction
E. Donald Bledgett, Executive Director, Department of Special Education
Melvin Yanow, Supervisor of Remedial Reading
Jacob Butschli, Supervising Teacher, Reading Center
Earl Powell, Principal, Victor L. Berger School
Phyllis Wiggins, R.C. Teacher
Robert E. Baer, Principal, Brown Street School
Alice Scholtz, R.C. Teacher
Ralph Bureta, Principal, Congress School
Veronica Perlberg, R.C. Teacher
Alice Seeboth, Principal, Doerfler School
Lynn Corriveau, R.C. Teacher
Gladys Coughlin, Principal, Fifth Street School
Mary Mosley, R.C. Teacher
Wayne Pool, Principal, Fourth Street School
Milda Fenner, R.C. Teacher
Oliver Sand, Principal, Fratney Street School
Gloria Weber, R.C. Teacher
Grant Gordon, Principal, Garfield Avenue School
Marcelaine Krembs, R. C. Teacher
Walter Miller, Principal, U.S. Grant School
Dorothy Jaye, R.C. Teacher
Adela Ludwig, Principal, Greenfield School
Marion Bannach, R.C. Teacher
Henry Litzow, Principal, Rutherford B. Hayes School
Elma Messling, R.C. Teacher
Bryon Helfert, Principal, Oliver Wendell Holmes School
Katherine Dettman, R.C. Teacher
Herman Goldberg, Principal, Hopkins Street School
Georgiana Hollister, R.C. Teacher
Clara Johnson, Principal, Albert E. Kagel School
Betty Christian, R.C. Teacher
Sarah Graffenberger, Principal, Lincoln Avenue School
J. Terrance Duffey, R. C. Teacher
Adele Andreucetti, Principal, Lloyd Street School
Signe Pearson, R.C. Teacher
John Russell, Principal, MacDowell School
Marie Braun, R.C. Teacher
Ernst Rintelmann, Principal, William McKinley School
Virginia Smith, R.C. Teacher
Howard Erich, Principal, Alexander Mitchell School
Patricia Derocher, R.C. Teacher
Walter Marshall, Principal, Ninth Street School
Elsie Pett, R.C. Teacher

Edward Yahle, Principal, Henry L. Palmer School
Joyce Hall, R.C. Teacher
Anton Bachman, Principal, Siefert School
Jacqueline Kravit, R.C. Teacher
Margaret Lederle, Principal, Twelfth Street School
Wilma Bey, R.C. Teacher
Richard Steller, Principal, Twentieth Street School
Helen Werner, R.C. Teacher
Kenneth Place, Principal, Vieau School
Michael McElwee, R.C. Teacher

EVALUATION PERSONNEL

William Ashbaugh, Executive Director, Department of Psychological Services and Educational Research
G. Dwight Rowe, Coordinator, Educational Research
John Belton, Supervisor, Educational Research
John Keyser, Research Associate

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
General Purpose	1
Significance of this Project	1
Project Dates	3
Objectives	3
PROJECT POPULATION	4
Schools Included in the Project	4
Pupils Served by this Project	6
PROJECT PROCEDURES AND ACTIVITIES	7
Selection Procedures	7
Project Operational Procedures	9
EVALUATION PLAN	10
Research Design	10
Reading Achievement Skills	10
Student Attitudes	11
School Personnel Reactions	12
Limitations of Data Collection Procedures	12
RESULTS	13
Reading Achievement	13
Student Attitude	14
School Personnel Reactions	16
SUMMARY	20
APPENDIXES	22

INTRODUCTION

This project, organized and conducted by the Milwaukee Public Schools, Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Department of Special Education (Remedial Reading), was funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. It was set up to extend and expand the reading improvement program; namely, elementary reading centers, to fifteen additional schools which fall within the definition of project area schools (those having a concentration of culturally disadvantaged pupils). The evaluation of the program was directed by the Department of Psychological Services and Educational Research of the Milwaukee Public Schools.

General Purpose of this Project

The general purpose of the project is to strengthen and extend reading services through the establishment of additional reading centers in elementary schools in areas of cultural deprivation as determined by both the Social Development Commission and the Board of School Directors of Milwaukee.

Significance of this Project

One of the greatest contributors to reading difficulty for the culturally disadvantaged child is his home environment. A rich background of experiences is needed before he can understand the world of books. Within the homes of this group, a scarcity of books, magazines, and other cultural media is often apparent. This restricts growth markedly and permits the child to bring to a school situation only the most meager kind of experiential background. It has been found that not only were there fewer books in lower class homes, but

lower class children were read to less frequently. It has also been found that children with rich information backgrounds were better equipped for reading than were children of meager backgrounds.

In many cases, if there is literature present in the home, it cannot be utilized to its full advantage due to the child's difficulty in reading. Dr. Mary Austin indicated that by the 9th grade the culturally deprived child is from one to six years retarded in reading, that he belongs to the group we often refer to as the underachievers, his attitude toward school is usually negative and he becomes an early dropout. These children also fail to develop reading ability adequately because they lack the necessary discrimination of sounds.

Continuous growth in both ability to read and desire to read is crucial to academic progress. The transfer of reading ability to the curriculum content areas can be exceedingly confusing and frustrating for the culturally deprived, since their cultural heritage condemns them to struggle for any progress in skill and knowledge.

The Milwaukee Public Schools has operated a reading improvement program in numerous centers for a number of years. These centers take the reader at his present level of achievement and allow him to move as rapidly as possible to a level of reading achievement commensurate with his potential or capacity. Special activities involving small groups and individual instruction are included. Thus, remedial reading help differs only in degree and intensity from regular reading instruction. Each pupil in the reading center is helped to see evidence of his own improvement. Effort is also made to increase his self image, motivation and self direction. The reading center also tries to instill in each pupil the desire to read for pleasure as this sets the stage for further learning and greater achievement in reading.

It is to be noted that these desirable services were not offered at fifteen of the elementary schools which fall within the definition of project area schools; hence, the need for this project. Reading center services would also be extended to pupils of non-public school systems.

Project Dates

This project operated for the duration of the 1966-67 school year (September 6, 1966 through June 16, 1967). The project operated in three of the schools for the entire year and in other schools for only one semester. A detailed description of this operation schedule will be given later in this report.

Objectives

The specific objectives of the program were:

1. To extend and expand reading center services for pupils in grades 3-8, public and non-public, who have evidenced difficulty in developing reading skills and are at least one year or more retarded in reading achievement with regard to their mental capacity.

2. To develop specific skills needed in the reading process.

3. To develop within each child a feeling of confidence and to provide for the enjoyment of both the process and results of reading.

PROJECT POPULATION

Schools Included In This Project

During the first semester the project was implemented in thirteen of the fifteen proposed schools. Two of the fifteen schools did not participate in the project because of the unavailability of qualified personnel to teach in the Reading Centers. At the beginning of the second semester the E.S.E.A. project area schools were redefined and the funding was switched to include a different population of schools. Three of these schools were retained from the first semester population and twelve of the schools were new to the project. All fifteen schools participated in the activities of the project during the second semester.

The project included Catholic Archdiocese and Missouri Synod Lutheran school pupils. These non-public school children were served in fourteen project schools at some time during the school year. Generally when non-public service was included the public school children attended the Reading Center in the morning and the non-public children attended in the afternoons. The non-public phase of the project was implemented at various times throughout the school year due to administrative problems. For this reason, these pupils were not extensively included in the evaluation sample. However, some data on non-public school children is presented later in this report.

A complete list of all schools participating in this project as well as their project funding dates and non-public school involvement is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1

PROJECT SCHOOL INFORMATION

School	FIRST SEMESTER		SECOND SEMESTER	
	Project Operated	Non-Public Participated	Project Operated	Non-Public Participated
Allen	No	—	No	—
Berger	Yes	Yes	No	—
Brown	No	—	No	—
Congress	Yes	No	No	—
Doerfler	Yes	No	No	—
Fifth Street	No	—	Yes	Yes
Fourth Street	No	—	Yes	No
Fratney	Yes	Yes	No	—
Garfield	No	—	Yes	Yes
Grant	Yes	Yes	No	—
Greenfield	Yes	No	No	—
Hayes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Holmes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Hopkins	No	—	Yes	Yes
Kagel	Yes	Yes	No	—
Lincoln Avenue	Yes	Yes	No	—
Lloyd	No	—	Yes	No
Longfellow	No	—	No	—
MacDowell	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
McKinley	No	—	Yes	Yes
Mitchell	Yes	Yes	No	—
Ninth Street	No	—	Yes	No
Palmer	No	—	Yes	No
Siefert	Yes	No	Yes	No
Twelfth Street	No	—	Yes	Yes
Twentieth Street	No	—	Yes	Yes
Vieau	No	—	Yes	Yes

Pupils Served By This Project

A total of 1,005 pupils were served by this project of which 237 were non-public school children. The pupils attended for varying periods of time dependent upon their own particular situation. Some were released from the project because they were reading up to grade level and others transferred to other schools. Participation of several non-public school children was terminated because their parents objected to their walking back and forth between the public and non-public schools.

PROJECT PROCEDURES AND ACTIVITIES

Selection Procedures

The original fifteen schools were selected as project schools since they are located in the target area of high population density and mobility. They also fit the selection criteria since a large percentage of so-called culturally disadvantaged pupils, as defined by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, are attending these schools. In addition, these schools did not have a reading center program or any type of remedial reading service. Space was also available in these buildings for operation of the project. The schools in the project were reassigned at the beginning of the second semester so that the pupils served would better fit the redefined E.S.E.A. "target area".

Pupils, both public and non-public, were selected on the basis of certain criteria:

1. All evidenced difficulty in developing reading skills and were at least one year or more retarded in reading achievement from their mental capacity as measured by standardized test of intelligence and reading achievement.

2. Priority was indicated for these pupils who were the most retarded in reading and generally to those with average and above average intelligence.

3. Children enrolled from non-public schools were included on a similar referral basis through a liaison administrative school official.

Each of the three specially trained reading center teachers selected holds a state license for remedial reading, has specific knowledge of the effects of cultural deprivation, and child development. Has had experience in the field of remedial reading, and has a general knowledge of educational and teaching procedures in the middle elementary grades. They were selected because of their ability to be flexible, their willingness to cooperate in the operation of the project, and previous experience in working with culturally deprived children.

Primary responsibilities of the reading center teachers, in addition to working with project pupils on an intensive basis, included: (1) evaluation of reading and work analysis skills, (2) testing, (3) preparation of materials and planning of activities and learning tasks for project pupils, (4) compilation of materials and development of techniques found to be especially suitable in working with this type of child, and (5) assistance in the collection of data. In addition, interaction with public school classroom teachers was maintained by the reading specialists in order to correlate the experiences of project pupils with ongoing classroom curriculum.

The project was administered by the Supervisor of Remedial Reading of the Department of Special Education, Milwaukee Public Schools, hereafter known as the Coordinator or Project Director. Other ancillary personnel included a supervising teacher, also from the Department of Special Education, a research associate, and a secretary. The supervising teacher also served as the liaison school official between public and non-public schools.

The function of the Project Director and the Supervising Teacher was to administer the project as to selection of schools, pupils to receive this service, and personnel. In addition, they had the major responsibility for inservice orientation of the project staff, ordering of supplies and the writing of summary reports and budgets as required. The Coordinator holds a Masters degree and a state license in special education. The Supervising Teacher holds a Masters degree and a state license in remedial reading. They average 18½ years experience in this field as teachers and administrators.

The function of the research associate was to design a research and evaluation plan for the project, to establish procedures and a time-table for data collection, to design evaluative instruments to be used by project personnel in the implementation and analysis of the project's worth, to collect data relative to the selected design, and to prepare reports on the project.

Project Operational Procedures

The reading center program adapted reading instruction for low income culturally deprived children through a diagnostic approach which recognizes individual differences and the specific needs of each pupil.

Materials and equipment were specially selected to fulfill the needs of retarded readers in all of the reading centers. These included: high interest, low vocabulary books, highly motivating games, workbooks and electronic aides—visual equipment.

Reading center teachers worked on an intensive basis with small groups of six to eight public school pupils per 30-35 minute class period each morning, five days per week; and with the same size groups of non-public school pupils in the afternoons, five days per week. Generally the pupils were retained in the project for one semester although this was not always the case. When a child improved to the point where he was reading at his proper level, he was released from the project.

EVALUATION PLAN

Research Design

Two separate and distinct research designs were employed in order to evaluate this project. The first of these was quite specific to each particular school which was funded for this project. It consisted of the following components:

1. A test-retest study designed to identify changes in both silent and oral reading skills.
2. A test-retest study designed to identify changes in pupil attitudes.
3. Reactions from regular classroom teachers and reading center teachers from the schools in which the project operated.

The second research design is more general in nature and includes data from children in a random sample of all reading centers in the city. This study concerns itself with long-term gains of children participating in the reading centers. The data base is city-wide test information which is collected on each pupil at two year intervals. Thus the study concerns pupil changes over a two year time period. The rationale for performing this study is that long term gains are important and the reading center operation is similar in all schools regardless of location. This study could not be undertaken strictly within the project schools because in most of these test scores were not available. This study is presented in its entirety in Appendix A and will not be mentioned again in the body of this report. All information presented from this point on deals with the first study mentioned, i.e., the design concerning the Title 1 schools.

Reading Achievement Skills

Reading achievement was measured by reading center teachers in a random sample of all reading center participants in eight project schools during the

first semester and all reading center participants in project schools during the second semester. Students in the first semester sample were given the California Reading Test (silent reading) and the Wide Range (oral reading.) These students were tested in September and again in January. This procedure yielded a total of 316 students who took both tests (pretest and post test) in silent reading achievement and 318 students who took both tests in oral reading achievement. Of these totals 41 and 42 students respectively were from non-public schools.

The schools in the second semester sample furnished similar data to the first semester sample except that students were tested on the date when they entered the reading center and again on the date when they completed their instruction. That is, some of the students were in the reading center for two semesters, some for one semester, and a few for intermediate periods of time. The second semester testing schedule yielded 529 students who had taken both tests (pretest and post test) in silent reading achievement and 481 students who had taken both tests in oral reading achievement. The data were analyzed by computing the reading grade equivalent when the student was pre-tested and again when post tested. A gain in reading grade equivalent could then be determined by comparing these two scores. Mean gains in grade equivalents were then determined and these were compared to test norm data. The results of the analysis will be given later in this report.

Student Attitudes

Student attitudes were measured with a locally devised attitude instrument (see Appendix B). This instrument was given to all students in three randomly selected reading centers in September and again in January. The instrument elicited student responses to questions concerning their attitudes about school, reading, and reading center activities. The responses were separated according

to whether the pupil attended a public or non-public school. They were then tabulated and Chi-square tests were performed on each question in order to determine if pupil attitudes had changed between September when they were first tested and January when they were retested. The results of this analysis will be given in a subsequent section of this report.

School Personnel Reactions

Reactions concerning the Reading Center Project were solicited from regular elementary classroom teachers (see Appendix C) and the project reading center teachers (see Appendix D). These questionnaires were mailed in May and responses were kept anonymous. Each questionnaire item was then tabulated to give a concensus answer to each question. These data yielded a subjective judgment of the value of the program. The actual findings will be presented later in this report.

Limitations of Data Collection Procedures

The data presented within this report are limited by the fact that there is no comparison group. Data of this type were not collected at the specific request of the project administrative personnel. Comparative data is however included in the auxillary report given in Appendix A.

RESULTS

Reading Achievement

Both oral and silent reading achievement were measured by a test-retest type of evaluation design. The design was repeated twice - once for centers operating for the first semester only and again for centers where data was collected for the entire year. The data from the first semester testing is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2

FIRST SEMESTER READING ACHIEVEMENT TEST DATA

TEST GROUP	SILENT READING ACHIEVEMENT Mean Gain	N	ORAL READING ACHIEVEMENT Mean Gain	N
Public Schools	0.647	274	0.611	277
Non-public Schools	0.598	42	1.183	41
Combined	0.640	316	0.685	318

When inspecting the data in Table 2, it is important to recall that none of these pupils participated in the reading center for more than one semester between the pretest and the post test. Thus the expected norm group change for this time period is 0.5 years. Since the children in the reading centers are identified underachievers it would be expected that their achievement gain would be less than for the norm group. However, this is not the case. The mean gains of the children tested were all in excess of 0.5 years indicating that this previously underachieving group is now progressing at a rate greater than would normally be expected. The greatest gain was made by the non-public school children in oral reading, and the smallest gain was made by the public school children in silent reading. However, all gains were greater than the norm group change for this time period.

The second semester data substantiate the findings in the first semester design. For this analysis the public and non-public children were not separated

into groups for data analysis. The prime difference between the data from the two semesters is that many children in the second group were in the reading center for more than one semester. By actual tabulation, the mean reading center attendance for the second group was 0.738 years (approximately 1½ semesters). The mean gain in silent reading achievement for this group was 0.764 years for the sample of 529 pupils, and the mean gain for oral reading achievement was 0.891 years for 481 pupils. As found in the first semester data, both gains were in excess of what would be expected from the norm group.

Student Attitude

Student attitudes were measured by a locally devised attitude instrument. This instrument was administered to all students in three randomly selected reading centers which participated in this project during the first semester. The instrument was given by an independent tester from the Department of Psychological Services and Educational Research in September and again in January. The instrument elicited responses from the pupils as to whether they felt "good", "neither good nor bad," or "bad" about school and reading center related topics. The questionnaire data were analyzed by means of a Chi-square test. This test compares their responses from the first test administration with the response from the second administration. If pupil attitudes changed during the course of the semester, and these changes are being picked up by the attitude instrument, then significant Chi-square values would be identified by the data analysis. The student responses and Chi-square values for the student attitude instrument are given in Table 3.

TABLE 3

STUDENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

Summary statement of question (for complete statement see Appendix B.)		Public School Pupil Responses					Non-public School Pupil Responses				
		Good	Neither	Bad	Total Responses	X^2	Good	Neither	Bad	Total Responses	X^2
1. Attitude about school	pre	36	21	18	75		13	14	8	35	
	post	39	24	12	75	1.520	15	15	10	40	-0.065
2. Attitude about teachers	pre	61	11	3	75		22	8	5	35	
	post	59	12	4	75	-0.467	21	9	10	40	-1.419
3. Attitude about reading	pre	41	22	12	75		15	12	8	35	
	post	44	23	8	75	0.926	21	12	7	40	-0.734
4. Attitude about group involvement	pre	37	32	6	75		15	14	6	35	
	post	36	32	8	76	-0.290	18	17	5	40	0.320
5. Attitude about reading for pleasure	pre	60	10	4	74		21	8	6	35	
	post	67	5	4	75	2.023	29	8	3	40	-1.954
6. Self-image	pre	34	33	6	73		17	15	3	35	
	post	30	25	10	65	-2.597	19	15	6	40	-0.779
7. Attitude about teacher help	pre	53	14	6	73		23	7	5	35	
	post	55	12	10	77	-1.081	30	3	7	40	2.534
8. Attitude about reading ability (self)	pre	19	28	28	75		10	11	14	35	
	post	27	32	16	75	4.928	7	22	11	40	4.239
9. Attitude about reading	pre	42	16	16	75		19	10	6	35	
	post	41	25	10	76	3.344	24	11	5	40	0.385

None of the Chi-squares were significant at the .05 level of confidence, however, the Chi-squares for question 8 were significant at .10 and .15 for the public and non-public school children respectively. This would indicate that the participants changed their attitudes to a moderate extent concerning their ability to read. The remaining Chi-squares did not appear to have a meaningful pattern.

School Personnel Reactions

A questionnaire (see Appendix C) was mailed to a random sample of elementary classroom teachers in May. All teachers had pupils from their room participating in the reading center. Twenty-one of the twenty-four teachers (88 per cent) responded to the questionnaire, and their responses are tabulated in Table 4.

TABLE 4

REGULAR CLASSROOM TEACHER REACTIONS

Summary statement of question (for complete question see Appendix C.)	Marked Positive Change		Small Positive Change		No Change		Small Negative Change		Marked Negative Change		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Do Reading Center students change in their confidence to school work?	7	33	11	53	3	14	0	0	0	0	21	100
2. Do they change their feeling of security in the school setting?	4	19	10	48	7	33	0	0	0	0	21	100
3. Do they change their attitude about school?	5	24	7	33	9	43	0	0	0	0	21	100
4. Do they change in their eagerness to read school materials?	7	33	8	38	5	24	1	5	0	0	21	100
5. Do they change in their desire to learn through reading?	5	24	9	43	7	33	0	0	0	0	21	100
6. Do they change their ability to employ reading skills?	4	19	13	62	4	19	0	0	0	0	21	100

	Very much		A little		Not at all		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
7. Does the Reading Center instruction compliment the reading instruction which you give in your class?	13	62	5	24	3	14	21	100

The data in Table 4 indicate that regular classroom teachers are generally positive about the reading center program. Their most positive responses had to do with their perception of the pupils eagerness to read, ability to employ reading skills, and self-confidence in performing school work. The most negative responses had to do with the questions concerning pupil attitude toward the general school setting, i.e., general school attitude, security in the school setting, and desire to learn. The data indicate that the project is quite effective in areas directly related to reading activities, but not quite as effective in areas which are general to the school setting.

The regular classroom teachers felt that the reading center instruction complemented their own instruction. Only 14 per cent made a negative response to this question.

The twenty-five reading center teachers who participated in this project were mailed a questionnaire (see Appendix D) in May. Twenty-four of the twenty-five (96 per cent) responded, and their reactions are tabulated in Table 5.

TABLE 5

READING CENTER TEACHER REACTIONS

1. How many children "successfully completed" your reading center this school year? (give number) Mean = 48.5

2. How many children, whether successful or not, attended your reading center this school year?(give number) Mean = 71.78

3. Have the regular teachers complemented your instruction when your students were in their regular classrooms? (check one)

11	11	2
46% - Very Much	46% - A Little	8% - Not at all

4. How do you feel about the support which you have received from the instructional staff (teachers, principal, etc.) in your school? (Check one)

20 (84%) - Support has been excellent
3 (12%) - Support has been adequate
1 (4%) - Support has been inadequate

5. How do you feel about the support which you have received from the Central Office? (check one)

14 (58%) - Support has been excellent
9 (38%) - Support has been adequate
1 (4%) - Support has been inadequate

The data in Table 5 indicate that the reading center teachers felt that they were successful with 69 per cent of the pupils who attended their reading centers, and they were quite positive about the instruction given in the regular classroom. They responded very favorably about the support they received from the staff within their school, but they were not so favorable about support from the Central Office staff. When asked what problems they had encountered during the school year, the model response was difficulty in utilizing new equipment in reading instruction. The most frequently mentioned achievement was success in developing reading skills of the participants. The teachers felt that they were quite successful in meeting the prime objective of reading improvement.

SUMMARY

The Elementary Reading Center Project was established to extend and expand the existing reading improvement program to fifteen additional schools in areas of economic deprivation. The project served 1,005 children who exhibited reading problems. Of this number, 237 (23 per cent) of the pupils were from non-public schools. The specific objectives of this project were:

1. To extend and expand reading center services for pupils in grades 3 - 8, public and non-public, who have evidenced difficulty in developing reading skills and are at least one year or more retarded in reading achievement with regard to their mental capacity.

2. To develop specific skills needed in the reading process.

3. To develop within each child a feeling of confidence and to provide for the enjoyment of both the process and results of reading.

This project operated for the duration of the 1966-67 school year, however, twelve of the schools included were changed as of February 10, 1967. This change was necessitated by a redefination of the schools which were given priority for E.S.E.A. funding. In total, the project operated in 25 different schools, but for both semesters in only three of these.

In order to evaluate this project a total of 867 students were tested for changes in reading achievement skills, 115 pupils were tested for changes in attitudes, 21 regular teachers responded to a mailed questionnaire, and 24 reading center teachers responded to a similar instrument.

The evaluation results were positive with respect to improving reading achievement skills. For students who participated in the reading center for one semester only, the mean gain was 0.640 years in silent reading and 0.685 years in oral reading, and for those who participated longer the mean gains per 0.738 years were 0.764 years for silent reading and 0.891 years for oral

reading. In all cases the gains exhibited by these "underachievers" exceeded that of the test norm group.

Student attitudes were not generally changed by the project. A moderate positive change was found in the area of "attitude about reading", but other changes were not apparent. This indicates that the project can change attitudes about reading, but this change is not generalized to other attitudes about school.

The school personnel reactions were quite positive with respect to the reading center project, and teachers held few reservations concerning the value of remedial instruction in reading.

Recommendations

The data suggest that this project is of general value to pupils with retarded reading development. It is recommended that this project be continued as presently organized and future research be directed toward identifying methods of improving the already adequate methods being employed.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX B

Date _____ School _____

Name _____ Teacher _____

Boy _____ Girl _____

1. How do you feel when it's time for school?

Good _____ Neither good nor bad _____ Bad _____

2. How do you feel when you think about the teachers in your school?

Good _____ Neither good nor bad _____ Bad _____

3. How do you feel about what you do in reading?

Good _____ Neither good nor bad _____ Bad _____

4. How do you think the children in your class feel about you?

Good _____ Neither good nor bad _____ Bad _____

5. How do you feel about reading just for fun?

Good _____ Neither good nor bad _____ Bad _____

6. How do you feel when you think about yourself?

Good _____ Neither good nor bad _____ Bad _____

7. How do you feel when your teacher helps you with your reading?

Good _____ Neither good nor bad _____ Bad _____

8. How do you feel about the way you read?

Good _____ Neither good nor bad_____ Bad _____

9. How do you feel when it's time for reading?

Good _____ Neither good nor bad _____ Bad _____

APPENDIX C

MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
Department of Psychological Services
and Educational Research

Elementary Reading
Center Project (E-2)

Teacher Questionnaire
Grade Taught_____

1. How many children in your class attended the reading center during the 1966-67 school year? (give number)_____

   Please answer the questions, 2 through 7 below according to the following key:

   5 - marked positive change
   4 - small positive change
   3 - no change
   2 - small negative change
   1 - marked negative change

2. In your opinion, do children who attend the reading center change their confidence in their ability to do school work? (see key) ___

3. Do they change their feelings of security in the school setting? (see key) ___

4. Do they change their attitude about school? (see key) ___

5. Do they change in their eagerness to read school oriented materials? (see key) ___

6. Do they change in their desire to learn through reading? (see key) ___

7. Do they change in their ability to employ basic reading skills? (see key) ___

8. Do you feel that reading instruction given in the reading center compliments the reading instruction you give in class?
   ☐ very much ☐ a little ☐ not at all

9. Please briefly describe what you feel is the most positive aspect of the reading center project.

10. Please briefly describe what you feel is the most negative aspect of the reading center project.

APPENDIX D

MILWAUKEE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
Department of Psychological Services
and Educational Research

Elementary Reading
Center Project (E-2)

Reading Center
Teacher Questionnaire

1. How many children "successfully completed" your reading center this school year? (give number) _____

2. How many children, whether successful or not, attended your reading center this school year? (give number) _____

3. Have the regular teachers complimented your instruction when your students were in their regular classrooms? (check one)

☐ very much ☐ a little ☐ not at all

4. How do you feel about the support which you have received from the instructional staff (teachers, principal, etc.) in your school? (check one)

☐ Support has been excellent

☐ Support has been adequate

☐ Support has been inadequate

5. How do you feel about the support which you have received from the Central Office? (check one)

☐ Support has been excellent

☐ Support has been adequate

☐ Support has been inadequate

6. Please describe the principle problems which you encountered during the school year.

7. Please describe the principle achievements which you have accomplished during the school year.